

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 10 2007**

Application Serial No: 10/568,157  
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: May 9, 2007

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 9, 2007. Claims 1-6 are pending.

#### Priority:

The present Office Action requests that a certified copy of the foreign priority document of this application be filed. Applicants note that a certified copy of this priority document was received by the International Bureau on October 15, 2004. Accordingly, a certified copy of the priority document need not be submitted. Withdrawal of this issue is requested.

The present Office Action also notes that four Japanese applications originally listed as priority documents on the official Filing Receipt are not mentioned in the Oath or Declaration filed on February 13, 2006. Applicants note that a Request for Corrected Filing Receipt was submitted on October 9, 2006 and a Corrected Filing Receipt was issued on December 7, 2006 with the correct foreign priority document listed. Withdrawal of this issue requested.

#### §103 Rejections:

Claims 1-6 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyauchi (US Patent No. 7,158, 364) or Nakamura '497 (US Patent No. 6,346,497) or Nakamura '753 (US Patent No. 6,620,753). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a dielectric ceramic composition comprising 100 parts by mole of  $\text{BaTiO}_3$ ,  $x_1$  parts by mole of  $\text{MnO}$ ,  $x_2$  parts by mole of  $\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_3$ ,  $x_3$  parts by mole of  $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$  and/or  $\text{Ho}_2\text{O}_3$ ,  $x_4$  parts by mole of oxide selected from the group consisting of  $\text{BaO}$ ,  $\text{CaO}$  and  $\text{SrO}$ , and  $x_5$  parts by mole of  $\text{SiO}_2$  and/or  $\text{GeO}_2$ , wherein  $0.5 \leq x_1 \leq 4.5$ ,  $0.05 \leq x_2 \leq 1.0$ ,  $x_1 + x_2 \leq 4.55$ ,  $0.25 \leq x_3 \leq 1.5$ ,  $0.5 \leq x_4 \leq 6$  and  $0.5 \leq x_5 \leq 6$ . An advantage of these features is that a dielectric ceramic composition can be provided which has a high insulation resistance even after the baking in a reducing atmosphere, whose deterioration of the insulation resistance (IR) with time is small (i.e., the IR accelerated life is long), whose capacitance change relative to temperature change is small and which is resistant to reduction, to provide a multilayer ceramic capacitor utilizing the composition as the

Application Serial No: 10/568,157  
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: May 9, 2007

material for the dielectric layer between electrodes, and to provide an electronic component including a portion made of the composition.

Neither Miyauchi, nor Nakamura '497, nor Nakamura '753 alone or in combination teach or suggest these features. Applicants first note that Miyauchi is not available as prior art because it has an effective prior art date of March 1, 2005, which is later than the priority date of this application. With regards to Nakamura '497, and Nakamura '753, both references fail to teach or suggest the use of  $\text{BaTiO}_3$ ,  $\text{MnO}$ ,  $\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$  and/or  $\text{Ho}_2\text{O}_3$ , an oxide selected from the group consisting of  $\text{BaO}$ ,  $\text{CaO}$  and  $\text{SrO}$ , and  $\text{SiO}_2$  and/or  $\text{GeO}_2$ . Moreover, these references also do not teach or suggest the numerical mole proportions for each of the components listed above, as required in claim 1. The rejection suggests that these numerical mole proportions are the result of routine laboratory work. However, to obtain the unexpected advantages of the claimed invention it is critical that each component of claim 1 be included in the dielectric ceramic composition and be within the numerical mole proportions provided in claim 1 (see pages 17-23 and Figures 2-5). Nowhere does Nakamura '497 nor Nakamura '753 suggest or contemplate all of the unexpected advantages described above. Thus, the features of claim 1 are the result of more than routine laboratory work and cannot be obvious based on the prior art. For at least these reasons claim 1 is not suggested by Miyauchi, Nakamura '497 or Nakamura '753. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Application Serial No: 10/568,157  
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: May 9, 2007

Conclusion:


Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-6 are now in condition for allowance. In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: September 10, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902-0902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By:   
Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH/ahk